

Public Workshop Notes  
October 28, 2008  
Town Hill Mini Plan

1. Planning staff reviewed the agenda for the meeting. The agenda included going over the process and scheduling of the mini-plan, reviewing the design charrette workshop and discussing growth management in Town Hill.
2. Planning staff reviewed the key dates of the process going forward. The next workshop is scheduled for January 8, 2009. In the meantime the consultant team will be working on a draft village alternatives report using the feedback received up to this point through the workshop process. Staff noted that meeting notes, reports and information collected at previous workshops is available on the town's website.
3. After tonight's workshop a new phase of the process begins. This new phase includes a more active role by the consultant team and the creation of a first draft of the mini plan with different proposals for the village area. After tonight's workshop the consultant team and planning staff will work on producing the initial language of the report. The draft plan will be presented to the public at the January 8, 2009 workshop. Revisions to the plan will be made based on public comment at the January 8 meeting and used at the public design Charrette on either February 11 or February 26. The final language of the plan is due to be finished during the first half of April. A meeting participant asked if the process of creating a mini-plan for Town Hill was being done for other village in Bar Harbor. Staff explained that Town Hill is the only village where this is being done because the Comprehensive Plan calls for a mini-plan in only Town Hill.
4. Discussion began about the Future Land Use Map in the Comprehensive Plan. Planning staff outlined the different areas in Town Hill – New Village, Town Hill Village, Rural Residential, Rural and Critical Rural.
5. The specific language in the Comprehensive Plan was reviewed for each area depicted on the Future Land Use Plan beginning with the Town Hill Village. Staff noted the Town Hill Village area and the town's vision for directing new growth here by increasing housing density, allowing for more mixed use and provisioning public facilities like sewer and water.
6. Meeting participants commented on the Comprehensive Plan language referring to the Town Hill Village area and noted concern about allowing two housing units per acre of land without sewer. There was concern about the quality of groundwater if too many septic systems are approved.
7. Some meeting participants did not like the idea of public sewer in Town Hill because of the costs associated with installing the service. Others felt having a sewer system is important to the future growth of Town Hill because it lets the town grow without threatening groundwater quality.

8. One participant expressed concern about changing the existing language of the Comprehensive Plan because it already refers to Town Hill and the process for creating a mini-plan specifically for Town Hill is not necessary. Other participants liked the idea of making changes to the Town Hill portion of the Comprehensive Plan because it lets the community address issues like traffic and pedestrian access.

9. Staff reviewed the language in the Comprehensive Plan about creating design review in Town Hill. Questions from participants were about the logistics of implementing design review and how that process is administered currently in the Bar Harbor Village area.

10. Meeting participants and staff reviewed the language for the New Village areas of Town Hill. Participants wondered why there was not a transitional zone between the New Growth area and the Rural area. This may be something Town Hill residents want to change in the existing Comprehensive Plan.

11. Meeting participants and staff reviewed the Rural and Critical Rural area designations. This led to a discussion about requiring PUDs in Rural areas and the use of growth management tools like density transfers. Requiring PUDs in Rural areas was not generally favored by those commenting about it. Some participants noted they do not like the look of PUDs and prefer conventional subdivisions.